

BRIAN A. V. BREDESEN

“PERIOD II” DATA REPORT

submitted by

The Brian A. Technical Assistance Committee

March 30, 2006

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Steven D. Cohen
Senior Associate
Annie E. Casey Foundation
Baltimore, MD

Judy Meltzer
Deputy Director
Center for the Study of Social Policy
Washington, D.C.

Andy Shookhoff
Associate Director
Vanderbilt Child and Family Policy Center
Nashville, TN

Paul Vincent
Director
Child Welfare Policy and Practice Group
Montgomery, AL

“PERIOD II” TARGET DATA REPORT

I. Introduction

This report was prepared by the Technical Assistance Committee (TAC) pursuant to the provisions of the orders entered in *Brian A. v. Bredesen, Civ. Act. No. 3:00-0445 (Fed. Dist. Ct., M.D. Tenn)*.

The *Brian A.* Settlement Agreement (Settlement Agreement) entered on July 27, 2001 established requirements for certain “child welfare outcomes” and “practice performance indicators” (Settlement Agreement, XVI). These “performance targets” are established by the Settlement Agreement for three time periods. This report sets forth the extent to which the Department has met the targets established for “Period II.” Reporting Period II, as modified by the Stipulation of Settlement of Contempt Motion (entered on December 30, 2003), is the eighteen-month period running from June 1, 2004, through November 30, 2005.

The data for this report were generated by the DCS Office of Information Systems (OIS) Production Support division and the Office of Performance Enhancement Research and Development division. It is produced from the TNKids database using protocols established by the Department, in consultation with Chapin Hall, Family to Family and the TAC.

For some outcome and indicator targets, the Settlement Agreement is very specific in describing the manner for calculating the particular measure. For other targets, there is some ambiguity regarding the manner in which the measure should be calculated. There are also certain limits to the present capacity of the TNKids database that impact the ability of the Department to produce some of the data called for by the Settlement Agreement. For those targets for which the manner of measuring is ambiguous or for which the TNKids database capacity is limited, explanations are provided in the discussion of the outcome or indicator regarding the manner of measurement or the specific capacity limitation.¹

Citations to specific Settlement Agreement provisions are indicated in parentheses.

The Settlement Agreement refers only to statewide targets and outcomes. Nevertheless, the TAC has included data regarding regional variation in both the text and the Appendix to this report. In addition, consistent with its approach to reporting data in previous reports, the TAC has included in the Appendix a brief orientation to child welfare system data.

¹ At the time the Settlement Agreement was entered the parties may not have recognized either the ambiguity regarding how some target outcomes and indicators were to be calculated or the limitations of the Department’s aggregate reporting capacity. At some point in advance of the end of Period III the parties and the TAC will need to discuss how to approach the measurement and reporting of these outcomes and indicators.

II. Child Welfare Outcomes for Reporting Period II

The Settlement Agreement identifies seven areas of focus: reunification, adoption finalization, number of placements, length of time in placement, re-entry into placement, adoptive placement disruption, and achievement measures upon discharge for children discharged from custody because they reached the age of majority (18 years of age).

Each subsection below begins by setting forth in italics the specific language of the Settlement Agreement describing what is to be measured in each of these “child welfare outcome” areas and the target percentage for that measure for Period II.

A. Reunification (XVI.A.1)

For Period II, the Settlement Agreement states that *“at least 75% of children entering care after September 1, 2001, who are reunified with their parents or caretakers at the time of discharge from custody, shall be reunified within 12 months of the latest removal date.”*² For Period II, the statewide average for reunification² within 12 months was 74%, with Mid Cumberland, Shelby County, and Upper Cumberland Regions averaging below 70% and Northwest Region having the highest average with 86%. The Settlement Agreement further stipulates that *“of the remaining children (i.e. those who are not reunified with their parents or caretakers at the time of discharge from custody within 12 months of the latest removal date), 60% shall be reunified within 24 months of the latest removal date.”* The statewide average for reunification within 24 months was 76% with all regions meeting the target percentage.

B. Adoption Finalizations (XVI.A.2)

The Settlement Agreement states that, for Period II, *“at least 80% of adoptions that become final within the reporting period shall have become final within 6 months of the adoptive placement.”*³

The statewide average for this measure was 85%. Averages for Northwest Region, Shelby County, and Davidson County fell below 80%, while Knox County, Northeast Region, and Upper Cumberland Region each averaged above 90%.

² The reunification data regularly reported on by DCS and used by the TAC in this report includes both exits to “Reunification with Parents/Caretakers” and exits to “Live with Other Relatives.” The Settlement Agreement limits this measure to exits to “Reunification with Parent/Caretakers.” The parties’ acceptance of the TAC’s decision to deviate from the letter of the settlement agreement in this Period II report does not preclude either party from insisting that the data reported for Period III be limited to exits to “Reunification with Parents/Caretakers.”

³ Adoption finalization is a “point in time measure” and “adoptive placement is defined as the date the adoption contract is signed.” (XVI.A.2.)

C. Number of Placements (XVI.A.3)

For Period II, the Settlement Agreements states that *“at least 75% of children in care at any time during the reporting period shall have had two or fewer placements not including temporary breaks in placement for children who run away or require emergency hospitalization.”*⁴

The statewide average for this measure⁵ is 63% with all regions falling below the Period II target. The region with the highest percentage of children with two or fewer placements was Northwest with 67%. Knox and Hamilton had the lowest percentages, with 57% each.

D. Length of Time in Placement (XVI.A.4)

The Settlement Agreement states that, for Period II, *“at least 70% of the children in placement shall have been in placement for two years or less.”*⁶ The statewide average for this indicator was 77%, with all regions at or above the target percentage except Shelby County with 64% and Hamilton County with 68%.

The Settlement Agreement further provides that *“no more than 18% of the children in placement shall have been in placement for between two and three years.”* The statewide average for this indicator was 12%. All regions fell below the 18% target percentage, with Northwest the lowest at 6% and Shelby the highest at 16%.

Finally, the Settlement Agreement states that *“no more than 12% of the children in placement shall have been placed for more than three years.”* The statewide average for this indicator was 11%, with all regions at or below the target percentage, except Shelby with 20% and Hamilton with 17%.

E. Reentry (XVI.A.5)

The Settlement Agreement states that, for Period II, *“no more than 5% of the children who are discharged from foster care at any time up to the end of the reporting period shall reenter custody within 12 months of discharge from the prior custody episode.”*

⁴ According to the Settlement Agreement, *“measures in this section apply to children in care at any time during the reporting period and children still in care at the end of the reporting period. Placements made prior to September 1, 2001, shall not be counted in this measure. For children requiring emergency hospitalization who return to their immediately prior placement, that return shall not count as an additional placement.”* (XVI.A.3)

⁵ In its reporting, the Department has been using the term “two or fewer moves” to mean the same thing as “two or fewer placements.” The TAC has expressed its concerns about this to the Department, since “two or fewer moves” is the equivalent of “three or fewer placements.”

⁶ According to the Settlement Agreement *“this measure shall include all children who entered care after October 1, 1998 and either left care at any time during the reporting period or are still in care at the end of the reporting period. Measurement shall exclude children still in care at the end of the reporting period who are in a long term relative placement for whom a long term placement agreement has been signed, and shall exclude children in permanent foster care.”* (XVI.A.4.)

The Settlement Agreement specifies that *“measures in this section apply to children who are discharged from foster care at any time up to the end of the reporting period. For each child, reentry shall be determined from the date of discharge for a period of 12 months. The overall performance percentage of compliance on this measure shall be calculated 12 months after the end of the reporting period. This measure shall only be calculated for Periods I and II.”*

Because the terms of this measure require the measurement to be taken 12 months after the end of the period, the TAC will not be able to report on this outcome measure until after November 30, 2006.

F. Adoptive Placement Disruption (XVI.A.6)

For Period II, the Settlement Agreement states that *“no more than 6% of the adoptive placements that occurred in the reporting period shall have disrupted.”*⁷

The state not only met the target goal in this area, but met that goal by a substantial margin. The statewide average for this measure was 3%. All regions fell well within the Period II target of “no more than 6%” except the South Central Region which had an 8% adoption disruption rate.

G. Achievement Measures Upon Discharge (XVI.A.7)

The Settlement Agreement states that, for Period II, *“at least 85% of the children who are discharged from foster care during the reporting period because they reached the age of 18 shall have at least one of the following apply at the time of discharge: earned a GED, graduated from high school, enrolled in high school or college or alternative approved educational program for special needs children, currently enrolled in vocational training, or employed full time.”*⁸

The statewide average for these achievement measures was 63%.⁹ No regions reached the target percentage of 85%; the highest percentages occurred in Northwest Region with 81% and East Tennessee with 77%. Five regions fell below 60%: Davidson County, Hamilton County, Mid Cumberland, Shelby County, and Upper Cumberland.

⁷ Adoptive placement disruption is “defined as occurring between the signing of the adoption contract and finalization. Measures in this section apply to children who were placed in an adoptive home during the reporting period.” (XVI.A.6)

⁸ “This measure shall exclude children on runaway status at the time they reach the age of 18.” (XVI.A.7)

⁹ Some youth may have achieved two or more of these measures upon discharge. In those cases only one achievement was selected for this outcome. Achievements were selected in the following order: GED/High School Diploma, enrolled in school, employed (full time) at discharge.

III. Practice Performance Measures for Reporting Period II

The Settlement Agreement identifies seven areas of focus: parent-child visiting; sibling visiting; sibling separation; timely filing of petitions to terminate parental rights; timely placement in adoptive home; planned permanent living arrangement as a permanency goal; and in-region placements.

Each subsection below begins by setting forth in italics the specific language of the Settlement Agreement describing what is to be measured in each of these “practice performance” areas and the target percentage for that measure for Period II.

A. Parent-Child Visiting (XVI.B.1)

The Settlement Agreement provides that *“for children in the plaintiff class with a goal of reunification, parent-child visiting shall mean a face-to-face visit with one or both parents and the child which shall take place for no less than one hour each time (unless the visit is shortened to protect the safety or well-being of the child as documented in the child’s case record).”* For Period II, the Settlement states that *“30% of all class members with a goal of reunification shall be visited at least once every two weeks. For the remaining class members with a goal of reunification who are not visited once every two weeks, at least 70% shall be visited once a month.”*

The Settlement Agreement provides one clear exception: *“This standard does not apply to situations in which there is a court order prohibiting visitation or limiting visitation to less frequently than once every month”* (XVI.B.1(a)). There is also a provision that *“the child’s case manager may consider the wishes of a child (generally older adolescents) and document any deviation from usual visitation requirements”* (XVI.B.1(a)), but it is not clear whether such cases are to be exempted from the standard.

The TNKids system is not presently able to identify children whose visits with their parents would be subject to either exception, and therefore the data presented applies the standard to all class members.¹⁰

In addition, the Department applies this standard to children who have a permanency goal of adoption, but for whom parental rights have not yet been terminated.¹¹ The reporting on this performance measure therefore includes these class members as well.

¹⁰ These exceptions should be documented in the case file—in case notes, permanency plans, and in the TNKids visitation module; however, these are narrative text fields at this time and therefore gathering and reporting that information would require case file reviews. The parties agreed that conducting such a case file review was not an appropriate use of monitoring resources at this time, given that the Department does not contend at this point that it is meeting or close to meeting the performance target, even if the exceptions were to be excluded from the calculation.

¹¹ Under DCS policy, until parental rights are terminated, parents and children retain their right to visits and contact with each other. As with any other situation in which the interests of the child require a deviation from the visiting standard, if there is a reason to restrict visits prior to the ruling on a termination petition, that can be accomplished by seeking a court order to that effect.

As of the end of Reporting Period II, the statewide average for face-to-face visits occurring at least once every two weeks is 12%, with only two regions (Upper Cumberland at 29% and Northeast at 22%) nearing the 30% goal for this reporting period. Of those children not receiving visits every two weeks, the statewide average for this goal is 21% for children having visits once a month with a parent when the goal is reunification.

B. Sibling Visiting (XVI.B.2)

For Period II, the Settlement Agreement states that *“85% of all children in the class in placement who have siblings with whom they are not living shall visit with those siblings at least once a month. Of the remaining children in the class in placement who have siblings with whom they are not living and with whom they did not visit at least once a month, at least 90% shall visit at least once every two months.”*

This standard *“does not apply to situations when there is a court order prohibiting visitation or limiting visitation to less frequently than once every two months”* (XVI.B.2(a)). As is the case with reporting on parent child visits, TNKids is not able to produce a report on sibling visits that identifies and excludes children subject to this exception. The data presented therefore applies this standard to all class members.¹²

The statewide average for monthly sibling visits is 29%, with the Southwest region at 64%, coming closest to the Period II goal. Mid Cumberland has the lowest rate of monthly sibling visits for Period II (12%).

For those children not receiving sibling visits once a month, but at least receiving visits once every two months, the statewide average is 37%. The regions with the highest percentages of children falling into this category are Southeast at 67% and Northeast and Northwest at 60% each. (Southwest, which has the largest percentage of siblings visiting at least once a month, reports virtually no additional children experiencing sibling visits when measured against the lesser standard of bi-monthly sibling visits).

The statewide average for siblings not visiting either on a once a month or once every two months basis is 45%, with Davidson and Mid Cumberland reporting the highest rate of sibling visitation less frequent than once every two months at 67% and 65% respectively.

C. Sibling Separation (XVI.B.3)

For sibling separation, the Settlement Agreement states that for Period II, *“at least 80% of all siblings who entered placement during this reporting period shall be placed together in the same foster home or other placement.”*

¹² As with reporting on parent child visiting, identifying and eliminating these exceptions from the report would require a separate case file review, something that the parties agree is not an appropriate use of the monitoring resources at this time.

TNKids has only been able to capture this data in a reliable way since August 2005. Therefore, the TAC is not able to report on this practice performance measure.

D. Timely Filing of Petitions to Terminate Parental Rights (XVI.B.4)

The Settlement Agreement provides that *“at least 60% of children in the class with a sole permanency goal of adoption during the reporting period shall have a petition to terminate parental rights filed within three months of when goal was changed to adoption. Of the remaining children in the class with a sole permanency goal of adoption during the reporting period who did not have a petition to terminate parental rights filed within three months, at least 50% shall have a petition for termination of parental rights filed within 6 months of when the goal was changed to adoption.”*

Prior to January 1, 2005, the Department did not record this data in TNKids and the prior data system used by DCS to track adoption related performance did not provide the information necessary to produce the data for Period II reporting. As a result, the TAC is not able to report on this practice performance measure.

E. Timely Placement in Adoptive Homes (XVI.B.5)

The Settlement Agreement states that for Reporting Period II, *“at least 45% of children freed for adoption during the reporting period (for whom termination of parental rights was obtained) shall have an adoptive home identified and an adoption contract signed within 6 months of the termination of parental rights. Of the remaining children in the class who have been freed for adoption during the reporting period (for whom termination of parental rights was obtained) who have not had an adoptive home identified and an adoption contract signed within 6 months, at least 70% shall have an adoptive home identified and an adoption contract signed within 12 months of the termination of parental rights.”*

Prior to January 1, 2005, the Department did not record this data in TNKids and the prior data system used by DCS to track adoption related performance did not provide the information necessary to produce the data for Period II reporting. As a result, the TAC is not able to report on this practice performance measure.

F. Planned Permanent Living Arrangement as a Permanency Goal (XVI.B.6)

The Settlement Agreement states that for Period II, *“no more than 8% of children in the plaintiff class shall have a goal of permanent or long term foster care.”*

The Department performance in this area is well within the goal for Period II, based on measures determined on review of the permanency goal for all children on November 30, 2005. For all children in custody as of November 30, 2005, the statewide average for PPLA is 0.5%, with no region exceeding 3%.

G. In-Region Placements (XVI.B.7)

The Settlement Agreement states that for Period II, *“at least 80% of children in the class shall be placed within the region from which they entered placement or within a 75 mile radius of the home from which the child entered custody.”*

The TAC has assumed that the parties by adopting this measure intended that on any given day during the 18-month period, at least 80% of the children in the class would be placed within the 75-mile limit. However, the Settlement Agreement is unclear about how this practice performance measure is to be calculated.

For each of the past 18 months, the Department has been running a point-in-time report on the percent of children placed within 75 miles of home on the first day of each month. The TAC has therefore chosen to report on this measure by averaging the percentages from the 18 monthly reports produced during this Reporting Period. Using this method, the statewide percentage for children placed within a 75-mile radius of home during Period II is 91% with the regional percentage ranging from 88% (South Central) to 96% (Northwest).

Of those class members who were in care on the last day of the Period II reporting period (November 30, 2005), 92% of those children were placed within a 75-mile radius from the home for which they entered care. A regional analysis of the November 30 data reflects that each region on that day had exceeded the target of “more than 80%” within the 75-mile limit.

APPENDIX A

A Brief Orientation to DCS Child Welfare System Data: Looking at Children in Foster Care from Three Different Viewpoints

Typically, when data are used to help people understand the children who are served by the child welfare system, one of three viewpoints is presented. The “viewpoints” are: “point in time” data; “entry cohort” data; and “exit cohort” data. Each viewpoint helps answer different questions.

If we want to understand the day-to-day workload of DCS and how it is or is not changing, we want to look from a “point in time” viewpoint. For example, we would use point-in-time information to understand what the daily out-of-home care population was over the course of the year—how many children were in out-of-home placement each day, how many children in the system on any given day were there for delinquency, unruly behavior, or dependency and neglect, and how that daily population has fluctuated over this particular year compared to previous years. Knowing whether the number of children in care on any given day is increasing, decreasing or staying the same is also important. A graph that compares snapshots of the population for several years on the same day every month (the same “point in time”) provides a picture of the day-to-day population and its change over time.

But if there is a trend—for example, in Tennessee, that the number of children in care on any given day has been increasing somewhat over time—it is hard to understand the cause(s) of the increase by looking at “point-in-time data”. For example, were more children committed to DCS custody in 2005 than in past years? Or is the increase the result of children staying in the system longer (fewer children getting released from custody during 2005) than in previous years? For this answer we need to look at “cohort data.”

The question whether more children entered custody in 2005 than entered in 2004 is answered by comparing the total number of children who entered custody in 2005 (the 2005 “entry cohort”) with the number of children who entered custody in 2004 (the 2004 “entry cohort”).

A focus on entry cohort data is also especially helpful to assess whether the system is improving from year to year. Is the system doing a better job with children who entered in 2005 than with the children who entered in 2004? Comparing the experiences in care of these two groups (entry cohorts) of children—their stability of placement while in care, how often they were placed in family rather than congregate settings, how often they were placed close to their home communities rather than far away—is the best way of measuring year to year improvement in these and other important areas of system performance.

There are certain questions for which looking at “exit cohort” data is most helpful. If we want to understand the population of children that may need services after they return to

their families, we would need the exit cohort view. These are children with whom DCS would be working to make sure that reunification is safely and successfully achieved. Re-entry into foster care is a sign of a failed reunification. It is therefore important to measure the percentage of children exiting care during any given year who re-enter custody within a year of discharge. Comparing the re-entry rates of children who exited care in 2005 (the 2005 “exit cohort”) with the re-entry rates of those children who exited care in 2004 (the 2004 “exit cohort”) is one way of understanding whether the system is doing better when returning children to their families in ensuring that reunification is safe and lasting.

In general, the data that are most helpful for tracking system improvement over time are entry cohort data. If the system is improving, the children in the most recent entry cohort should have a better overall experience and better outcomes than children who entered in previous years. Since exit cohorts include children with a range of experience in the foster care system, some of which may extend back many years and precede recent improvement efforts, they are generally not useful for understanding trends over time.

The data reported in this Period II report are the “point in time” data and “exit cohort” data called for by the provisions of the Settlement Agreement. The TAC’s previous two monitoring reports (April 13, 2005; January 19, 2006) include a significant amount of “entry cohort” data.

APPENDIX B

Regional Data

I. Child Welfare Outcomes for Reporting Period II

A. Reunification (XVI.A.1)

Region of Assignment	XVI.A.1 Time to Reunification*					Total Reunified
	Within 12 Months		Within 24 Months		24 Months or More	
	Number	Percent **	Number	Percent ***	Number	
Davidson	571	75.4%	143	76.9%	43	757
East Tennessee	751	77.4%	164	74.9%	55	970
Hamilton	180	71.4%	57	79.2%	15	252
Knox	234	73.1%	63	73.3%	23	320
Mid Cumberland	537	68.4%	194	78.2%	54	785
Northeast	539	79.3%	125	88.7%	16	680
Northwest	317	85.9%	43	82.7%	9	369
Shelby	383	66.3%	123	63.1%	72	578
South Central	374	77.3%	81	73.6%	29	484
Southeast	370	72.5%	108	77.1%	32	510
Southwest	307	71.9%	83	69.2%	37	427
Upper Cumberland	355	66.1%	152	83.5%	30	537
Total	4918	73.7%	1336	76.3%	415	6669

* Includes both exits to Reunification to Parents/Caretakers and Live with Other Relatives

** Formula = number reunified within 12 months/ total reunified

*** Formula = number reunified within 24 months/ (total reunified – number reunified within 12 months)

B. Adoption Finalizations (XVI.A.2)

Region of Assignment	XVI.A.2 Time to Adoption				Total Adopted
	Within 6 Months of Contract Signed		6 Months or More from Contract Signed		
Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Davidson	55	77.5%	16	22.5%	71
East Tennessee	192	83.8%	37	16.2%	229
Hamilton	71	89.9%	8	10.1%	79
Knox	171	94.0%	11	6.0%	182
Mid Cumberland	158	81.4%	36	18.6%	194
Northeast	188	91.3%	18	8.7%	206
Northwest	47	70.1%	20	29.9%	67
Shelby	166	72.8%	62	27.2%	228
South Central	88	83.0%	18	17.0%	106
Southeast	56	87.5%	8	12.5%	64
Southwest	76	87.4%	11	12.6%	87
Upper Cumberland	125	92.6%	10	7.4%	135
Total	1393	84.5%	255	15.5%	1648

Report includes all Brian A. class members exiting custody to adoption during the reporting period and calculates the number of months between the adoptive placement signing date and the adoption finalization date.

C. Number of Placements (XVI.A.3)

XVI.A.3 Number of Placements Period II (18-Months)					
Region of Assignment	Number of Placements *				Total Children
	Two or fewer placements		Three or more placements		
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Northwest	492	67.3%	239	32.7%	731
Shelby	1356	66.9%	670	33.1%	2026
South Central	691	65.6%	362	34.4%	1053
Upper Cumberland	899	65.6%	471	34.4%	1370
Southwest	604	65.0%	325	35.0%	929
East Tennessee	1609	65.0%	867	35.0%	2476
Southeast	665	64.1%	373	35.9%	1038
Northeast	1029	62.6%	614	37.4%	1643
Mid Cumberland	1272	62.6%	761	37.4%	2033
Davidson	1032	59.6%	699	40.4%	1731
Hamilton	482	57.4%	357	42.6%	839
Knox	623	57.4%	463	42.6%	1086
Total	10754	63.4%	6201	36.6%	16955

Includes all Brian A. class members in custody for at least one day during this time period with placements made by the end of the period.

*Number of placements calculation excludes temporary breaks in placement and any placement made prior to September 1, 2001, per Brian A. Settlement Agreement. Temporary breaks in placement are defined as in-home, trial-home visits, and runaway placements, as well as in-patient psychiatric care and medical/surgical hospital stays of ten days or less.

D. Length of Time in Placement (XVI.A.4)

Region of Assignment	XVI.A.4 Length of Time in Placement						Total
	Less than 2 Years		Between 2 and 3 Years		3 Years or Greater		
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Davidson	1296	76.4%	207	12.2%	193	11.4%	1696
East Tennessee	1966	80.5%	233	9.5%	244	10.0%	2443
Hamilton	541	68.1%	119	15.0%	135	17.0%	795
Knox	770	73.5%	147	14.0%	130	12.4%	1047
Mid Cumberland	1561	78.8%	215	10.8%	206	10.4%	1982
Northeast	1310	81.6%	168	10.5%	127	7.9%	1605
Northwest	607	84.4%	40	5.6%	72	10.0%	719
Shelby	1167	63.8%	297	16.2%	366	20.0%	1830
South Central	816	79.5%	127	12.4%	83	8.1%	1026
Southeast	807	78.9%	133	13.0%	83	8.1%	1023
Southwest	701	78.7%	96	10.8%	94	10.5%	891
Upper Cumberland	1060	77.7%	205	15.0%	99	7.3%	1364
Total	12602	76.7%	1987	12.1%	1832	11.2%	16421

Report includes all Brian A. class members entering care after 10/1/98, in custody for at least 1 day during this report period. Time calculated by 2 methods: exits from care length of time = release date – custody date and still in care length of time = report end date – custody date.

E. Reentry (XVI.A.5)

Because the terms of this measure require the measurement to be taken 12 months after the end of the period, the TAC will not be able to report on this outcome measure until after November 30, 2006.

F. Adoptive Placement Disruptions (XVI.A.6)

XVI.A.6 Adoptive Placement Disruption			
Region of Assignment	# of Adoptive Placements	# of Adoptive Placement Disruptions	% of Adoptive Placement Disruptions
Davidson	60	0	0.0%
East Tennessee	119	0	0.0%
Hamilton	30	1	3.3%
Knox	96	1	1.0%
Mid Cumberland	93	4	4.3%
Northeast	108	3	2.8%
Northwest	37	1	2.7%
Shelby	67	3	4.5%
South Central	51	4	7.8%
Southeast	43	1	2.3%
Southwest	43	1	2.3%
Upper Cumberland	77	2	2.6%
Total	824	21	2.5%

Report includes Brian A. class members with an adoptive placement during the reporting period.
The report is based on the number of adoptive placements made or disrupted – not unique children.

G. Achievement Measures Upon Discharge (XVI.A.7)

Region of Assignment	XII.A.7 Achievement Measures*								Total Discharges	Total Achieving One Measure	Total Percent Achievements
	GED/High School Diploma		Enrolled in School		Employed (Full Time)		None of These Three Measures				
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent			
Davidson	13	14.6%	39	43.8%	0	0.0%	37	41.6%	89	52	58.4%
East Tennessee	35	33.0%	47	44.3%	0	0.0%	24	22.6%	106	82	77.4%
Hamilton	12	17.6%	25	36.8%	0	0.0%	31	45.6%	68	37	54.4%
Knox	16	25.8%	25	40.3%	0	0.0%	21	33.9%	62	41	66.1%
Mid Cumberland	24	18.5%	48	36.9%	1	0.8%	57	43.8%	130	73	56.2%
Northeast	23	33.3%	23	33.3%	0	0.0%	23	33.3%	69	46	66.7%
Northwest	9	25.0%	20	55.6%	0	0.0%	7	19.4%	36	29	80.6%
Shelby	8	6.8%	61	52.1%	0	0.0%	48	41.0%	117	69	59.0%
South Central	10	23.8%	15	35.7%	1	2.4%	16	38.1%	42	26	61.9%
Southeast	14	26.9%	18	34.6%	0	0.0%	20	38.5%	52	32	61.5%
Southwest	8	17.8%	19	42.2%	0	0.0%	18	40.0%	45	27	60.0%
Upper Cumberland	14	21.9%	24	37.5%	0	0.0%	26	40.6%	64	38	59.4%
Total	186	21.1%	364	41.4%	2	0.2%	328	37.3%	880	552	62.7%

Report includes Brian A. class members exiting care at age 18 who were not on runaway status and did not exit to permanency (adoption, live with relatives, reunification).

* Some youth may have achieved two or more of these measures upon discharge. In those cases, only one achievement was selected for this outcome. Achievements were selected in the following order: GED/High School diploma, enrolled in school, employed (full-time) at discharge.

II. Practice Performance Measures for Reporting Period II

A. Parent-Child Visiting (XVI.B.1)

Parent-Child Visiting (XVI.B.1)

Region of Assignment	Total Report Class Members	Visits Every Two Weeks		Visits Once Per Month	
		Total Class Members	Percentage	Total Class Members	Percentage
Davidson	496	19	3.83%	53	10.69%
East Tennessee	757	66	8.72%	177	23.38%
Hamilton	229	13	5.68%	31	13.54%
Knox	322	45	13.98%	86	26.71%
Mid Cumberland	571	56	9.81%	107	18.74%
Northeast	390	87	22.31%	77	19.74%
Northwest	167	20	11.98%	56	33.53%
Shelby	696	26	3.74%	82	11.78%
South Central	248	41	16.53%	62	25.00%
Southeast	246	42	17.07%	66	26.83%
Southwest	209	28	13.40%	75	35.89%
Upper Cumberland	405	116	28.64%	105	25.93%
STATEWIDE	4736	559	11.80%	977	20.63%

Report **includes** Brian A. class with Goal of Reunify with Parent or Adoption (where full or joint guardianship of the child has not been obtained).

Report **excludes** clients in in-home or trial home visit or runaway placements on the last day of the reporting period.

Data related to duration of visit and data related to court-ordered visitation restrictions is not currently available, therefore was not considered in the production of this report.

Report data represents actual visits documented in the system and does not reflect visitation plan as documented in the permanency plan.

Report includes 52 children placed out of state for the reporting period.

B. Sibling Visiting (XVI.B.2)

Sibling Visiting (XVI.B.2)

Region	Total Client Sibling Groups	Sibling Groups Placed Together	Percent Placed Together	Total Not Placed Together	Percentage Not Placed Together	Visiting Monthly	Percent Visiting Monthly	Visiting Once Every 2 Months	Percentage Visiting Once Every 2 Months	Sibling Groups Not Visiting on a Monthly Basis	Percentage Not Visiting on a Monthly Basis
Davidson	137	98	71.53%	39	28.47%	6	15.38%	7	21.21%	26	66.67%
East Tennessee	203	154	75.86%	49	24.14%	11	22.45%	12	31.58%	26	53.06%
Hamilton	73	42	57.53%	31	42.47%	4	12.90%	10	37.04%	17	54.84%
Knox	85	61	71.76%	24	28.24%	11	45.83%	6	46.15%	7	29.17%
Mid Cumberland	145	119	82.07%	26	17.93%	3	11.54%	6	26.09%	17	65.38%
Northeast	106	96	90.57%	10	9.43%	5	50.00%	3	60.00%	2	20.00%
Northwest	36	20	55.56%	16	44.44%	6	37.50%	6	60.00%	4	25.00%
Shelby	195	136	69.74%	59	30.26%	14	23.73%	16	35.56%	29	49.15%
South Central	69	48	69.57%	21	30.43%	3	14.29%	9	50.00%	9	42.86%
Southeast	76	63	82.89%	13	17.11%	7	53.85%	4	66.67%	2	15.38%
Southwest	53	39	73.58%	14	26.42%	9	64.29%	0	0.00%	5	35.71%
Upper Cumberland	133	97	72.93%	36	27.07%	19	52.78%	9	52.94%	8	22.22%
Statewide	1311	973	74.22%	338	25.78%	98	28.99%	88	36.67%	152	44.97%

C. Sibling Separation (XVI.B.3)

TNKids has only been able to capture this data in a reliable way since August 2005. Therefore, the TAC is not able to report on this practice performance measure.

D. Timely Filing of Petition to Terminate Parental Rights (XVI.B.4)

Prior to January 1, 2005, the Department did not record this data in TNKids. As a result, the TAC is not able to report on this practice performance measure.

E. Timely Placement in Adoptive Homes (XVI.B.5)

Prior to January 1, 2005, the Department did not record this data in TNKids. As a result, the TAC is not able to report on this practice performance measure.

F. Planned Permanent Living Arrangement as a Permanency Goal (XVI.B.6)

Region	XVI.B.6 Goal: PPLA Relative and Non-Relative								Total PPLA
	Age Less Than 15 Years Old				Age 15 Years Old or Older				
	Child's Race				Child's Race				
	African American	Multi-Race	White	Other	African American	Multi-Race	White	Other	
Davidson	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	1.2%
East Tennessee	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
Hamilton	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
Knox	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%
Mid Cumberland	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%
Northeast	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	1.0%
Northwest	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	2.6%
Shelby	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%
South Central	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
Southeast	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Southwest	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.6%
Upper Cumberland	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%
Total	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.5%

Report includes active Brian A. class members as of the report date and their current permanency plan goal.

G. In-Region Placements (XVI.B.7)

In-Region Placements Point-in-Time (11/30/05)

Region	75 Miles and Under Total		Over 75 Miles Total		Region Total
	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage	
Davidson	697	92.4%	57	7.6%	754
East Tennessee	555	95.2%	28	4.8%	583
Hamilton	352	91.0%	35	9.0%	387
Knox	390	91.8%	35	8.2%	425
Mid Cumberland	444	94.9%	24	5.1%	468
Northeast	576	93.4%	41	6.6%	617
Northwest	143	93.5%	10	6.5%	153
Shelby	743	91.2%	72	8.8%	815
South Central	251	89.6%	29	10.4%	280
Southeast	207	95.0%	11	5.0%	218
Southwest	224	94.9%	12	5.1%	236
Upper Cumberland	339	96.6%	12	3.4%	351
Out of State	16	21.6%	58	78.4%	74
Statewide	4,937	92.1%	424	7.9%	5,361

This report summarizes placements by region within 75 miles from client's home address and those over 75 miles from client's home address. Client types selected are dependent/neglect and unruly. Children with placement types of trial home visit, in-home, and runaway are not included in the totals.

Note: there are 9 children not reported due to missing or invalid zip codes.

In-Region Placements by 18-Month Average (6/04-11/05)

Region	75 Miles and Under Total		Over 75 Miles Total		Region Total
	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage	
Davidson	696	92.0%	67	8.0%	763
East Tennessee	554	94.1%	34	5.9%	588
Hamilton	363	91.4%	45	8.6%	408
Knox	403	91.5%	33	8.5%	436
Mid Cumberland	464	94.6%	33	5.4%	497
Northeast	571	93.7%	30	6.3%	601
Northwest	160	95.5%	13	4.5%	173
Shelby	818	91.3%	83	8.7%	902
South Central	295	88.1%	42	11.9%	337
Southeast	262	93.4%	11	6.6%	273
Southwest	234	94.1%	19	5.9%	253
Upper Cumberland	340	94.6%	16	5.4%	357
Out of State (7 Months Avg.)	16	19.1%	66	80.9%	81
Statewide	5,175	91.3%	494	8.7%	5,669

This report summarizes placements by region within 75 miles from client's home address and those over 75 miles from client's home address. Client types selected are dependent/neglect and unruly. Children with placement types of trial home visit, in-home, and runaway are not included in the totals.